Document No. 0216 ea.wpd

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT EA Number: OR 128-02-16

BLM Coos Bay District Office Lease/Serial/Case file No.: N/A

Proposed Action Title/Type: Request to transport their timber across 1.6 miles of BLM controlled road.

Location of Proposed Action: Fall Creek , T. 29 S., R.11 W., Section 22, Will. Mer., Coos County, OR.

Applicant (if any): Swanson Group

Conformance With Applicable Land Use Plan: This proposed action is subject to the *Coos Bay District Resource Management Plan & Environmental Impact Statement* and its Record of Decision (BLM, 1995); which is in conformance with the *Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on Management of Habitat for Late Successional and Old Growth Forest Related Species Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl* and its Record of Decision (Interagency, 1994). This plan has been reviewed to determine if the proposed action conforms with the land use plan's terms and conditions as required by 43 CFR 1601.5.

Remarks: The Proposed Action is in compliance with the *Coos Bay District Resource Management Plan & Environmental Impact Statement* and its Record of Decision (BLM, 1995) RMP; hereby incorporated by reference. The RMP has been determined to be consistent with the standards and guidelines for healthy lands at the land use plan scale and associated time lines.

I. Purpose and Need for Proposed Action: The applicant has requested access to their land by utilizing 1.6 miles of existing BLM controlled road to facilitate the harvest and transportation of private timber. Denying this request would go against the policy of the Federal Government to provide reasonable access to private land owners across government lands.

II. Description of Alternatives, Including the Proposed Action:

No Action: Should the government deny the request, the applicant may modify their harvest plan and proceed as follows: They could attempt to construct approximately 4500 feet of new road, part of which would be adjacent to a third order stream on their land. This plan would necessitate construction of an additional mile of new road above the anticipated 3000 feet of new road under the proposed action.

Proposed Action: The purpose of this proposed action is to enable the applicant to harvest approximately 95 acres of their land using best management harvest methods. The applicant has requested the use of BLM controlled Road No. 29-11-22.0 A-portion B(0.82mi.) and a portion of BLM controlled Road No. 29-11-15.0 (0.77 mi.). In addition, they have requested to use approximately 1700 feet of existing graveled road controlled by Menasha Forest Products Corporation and construct approximately 500 feet of new road across Menasha managed land in the NW¼NW¼ of Section 22, T.29S., R.11W. Under this plan, the applicant will be constructing an additional 3000 feet of new road on their land. All of the new road construction would be located on or close to the ridge.

The applicant intends to rock the constructed road to facilitate a winter haul. The road will remain open after the completion of harvest activities for future management actions. The age class of the timber to be harvested is a mixture of 50-60 year old conifers and scattered hardwoods. This action encompasses a 95 acre clearcut with a third order stream traversing the westerly portion of the unit. The applicant has stated that they will be leaving a fifty foot buffer on this stream. The harvest is planned to be accomplished with a skyline system capable of at least one-end suspension. The applicant has stated that this will be a winter harvest operation occurring sometime between January 1st and April 1st.

The following design features would be implemented under the Proposed Action:

- The applicant shall wash all logging equipment and vehicles prior to initial entry to help prevent the spread of noxious weeds and Port Orford Cedar root rot disease.

- The applicant shall be required to install and maintain sediment control devices, as needed, along the haul route across BLM controlled roads. In addition the applicant will not be permitted to haul on BLM roads if the ground is already saturated from winter rains and more than 2 inches of precipitation is predicted in the project area over the next 24 hours, then winter haul shall be suspended. Operations may resume after the 24 hour suspension, except when another storm (exceeding 2 inches) is forecasted.

- The applicant has volunteered to limit construction work until after the 6th of August and to **adhere to daily timing restrictions (work will occur between 2 hours after sunrise and 2 hours before sunset) until the 15th of September**. Harvest and the transportation of timber will be between 1 October and 28 February, which is outside the murrelet and spotted owl nesting seasons of 1 March-30 September.

III. Environmental Consequences:

Environmental Impacts to Critical Elements of the Human Environment for the No Action alternative:

Critical Elements	Affected Yes	Affected No	Critical Elements	Affected Yes	Affected No
Air Quality		X	T & E Species	X(P)	
ACECs		X	S & M Botany		X
Cultural Resources		X	S & M Mollusk		X
Environmental Justice Concerns		X	Wastes, Hazardous/Solid		X
Farmlands, Prime/Unique		X	Water Quality	X(P)	
Floodplains		X	Wetlands/Riparian Zones	X(P)	
Native American Religious Concerns		X	Wild & Scenic Rivers		X
Noxious Weed Management		X	Wilderness		X
Port Orford Cedar Management		X	Energy Development		X

P = Private Land
F = Federal Land

Description of additional impacts under the No Action alternative:

Soils:
Should the No Action alternative be selected the need to gain access to the top of the ridge may be met by the construction of 4,500 feet of road in addition to the proposed road construction along the ridgetop. This additional disturbance will occur adjacent to the stream channel for approximately 1,500 feet on a Digger-Umpcoos-Rock outcrop association (15F) soil map unit. This soil type combination has been demonstrated though several watershed analyzes in adjacent local watersheds to be prone to failure where soils are thin and near streams. The applicant proposed to cross one stream through this action but would cross up to four streams based on our GIS data, two first order, one second order and the third order of a perennial nature the applicant refers to. The route described has been disturbed through past harvest and road building practices and this route may cross previously established road grades that failed. Aerial photo (1981) analysis of the area shows a large hillslope failure on an area where the proposed route will need to join up with the ridgetop.

The reconstruction of the old road grade and the new construction across an existing landslide, of the size noted, points to the unstable nature of this soil type and would be considered an unstable road location on a midslope position. This construction would most likely deliver both large and fine sediment into the stream and degrade the habitat that currently exists there for aquatic organisms.

The cumulative impact would be the degradation of the mainstream of Big Creek due to its close proximity to this proposed road.

Hydrology/Water Quality:
If the use of the requested route across BLM was denied, then the applicant would have to construct a 4500 foot road along a perennial tributary to Big Creek, and cross it as well as three intermittent stream channels on private. This alternative would cross more incised stream channels, and would involve mid-slope road construction. There is no information given in the application that this route would be rocked. Bases on these factors, this option would have much higher sediment delivery to the subject streams and would not be preferable.

Wildlife, Including T & E and S&M Species:

There will be no affect to nesting murrelets under the no action alternative. The harvest unit is over 0.25 miles from the occupied stand of timber.

Aquatic Habitat/Fisheries /Riparian Zones Including T & E Species:

Road Construction

Under the No Action alternative, the requested road use permit would be denied. Superior Lumber would likely access their land via an alternate route. The alternate route would require 4,500 feet of new road construction on private land. This route would require construction within a Riparian Reserve that would parallel a non-fish bearing tributary of Big Creek. The buffer width between the new road and stream channel on the north side would be narrow; between 80 to 150 feet. According to the soils report (see above), the soil type within the location of the alternate route is much less stable than the proposed route. Historic stereographic photography (1981) indicates that severe slope instability resulting in slope failures have occurred in this area. If this road failed, the 'No Action' alternative would result in long term water quality and aquatic habitat degradation. In addition to construction of the alternate route, the construction of an unimproved road (s) within and/or adjacent to the proposed ground-based harvest unit would still be required. The majority of this would be ridgetop and on a more stable soil type.

Hauling

Although only one of the streams on the No Action is perennial, the applicant would be hauling during the wet season and therefore the intermittent streams associated with the No Action haul would be flowing, thus providing additional opportunity for sediment delivery into the tributary to Big Creek and ultimately, mainstem Big Creek. The alternate route intersects with the Big Creek County road, which is paved the entire distance (1.4 miles) to State Highway 42. There would be no substantial environmental effect from hauling in the winter on the Big Creek County road.

Vegetation, Including T & E and S & M Species:

The will be no affect to federal lands under the no action alternative.

Port-Orford-cedar:

No affect is anticipated under the no action alternative.

Noxious Weeds:

There may be more potential to introduce noxious weeds on to the private land as it's unlikely that the washing of vehicles prior to initial entry will take place.

Cultural Resources:

Because all of the private land has been harvested in the past, no impacts to cultural resources are likely to occur on private land.

Hazardous Materials / Solid Wastes:

No affect is anticipated under the no action alternative.

Environmental Impacts to Critical Elements of the Human Environment for the Proposed Action alternative:

Critical Elements	Affected		Critical Elements	Affected	
	Yes	No		Yes	No
Air Quality	__	X	T & E Species	X(P)	__
ACECs	__	X	S & M Botany	__	X
Cultural Resources	__	X	S & M Mollusk	__	X
Environmental Justice Concerns	__	X	Wastes, Hazardous/Solid	__	X
Farmlands, Prime/Unique	__	X	Water Quality	__	X
Floodplains	__	X	Wetlands/Riparian Zones	X(P)	__
Native American Religious Concerns	__	X	Wild & Scenic Rivers	__	X
Noxious Weed Management	__	X	Wilderness	__	X
Port Orford Cedar Management	__	X	Energy Development	__	X

P = Private Land
F = Federal Land

Description of additional impacts under the Proposed Action alternative:

Soils:

Actions on Federal Land
Under the proposed action the impact to Federal land is confined to the use of the gravel roads during the winter for timber haul. The potential to deliver sediment to the stream network exists along the haul route from four sources. The surface of the road of the 29-11-15.0 is actively eroding at this time and will continue to do so when hauling occurs. The spacing of culverts is twice the necessary distance to remove ditch line flow to the outside edge of the road without causing further erosion at the culvert outlet. The condition of the pipes at the upper end of Road No. 29-11-15.0 and Road No. 29-11-15.6 are either badly deteriorated to the point of failure or need heavy maintenance to insure the culvert is not compromised. The final source of sediment is the surface of Road No. 29-11-22.0 at one stream crossing where the vegetated slope is less than 10 feet and the road has a drainage condition and grade that will allow fine sediment to overwash that vegetated strip and be delivered to the stream channel.

Even though the potential for erosion or active erosion exists on the haul route, delivery of fine sediment only can occur at two sites on the haul route. The construction of a sediment trap near the junction of the -22.0 and the -15.0 roads will prevent that delivery from occurring at that location. By correctly installing a run of silt fence at the sharp curve on Road No. 29-11-22.0 for 100 feet through the length of the corner, on the inside edge, and maintaining it during the period of haul should eliminate sediment delivery.

An indirect impact of hauling on this route in the winter is that the culverts on Roads No. 29-11-22.0 and 29-11-15.0 could plug, or fail from below as the condition of the 30+ year-old culverts is already in a compromised condition. Active piping is present on the -15.0 road culverts. These conditions could lead to the road grade failing at these points and a flush of debris would be delivered to the stream network at that time. Replacing the failing culverts and adding additional culverts would alleviate this risk.

Actions on Private Land
The impact to private land from this action is the potential to initiate landslide failures after harvest removal and site preparation activities. The 15F soil types are prone to failure from this activity and delivery of debris, sediment both coarse and fine, is a risk to the stream below. Construction of the ridge top road is negligible as it is occurring on a previously built sub-grade and the ability of the soil to filter the fine sediment from the disturbance is great. The infiltration rate of these soils exceeds 2 to 6 inches in an hour except where rock outcrops occur.

An indirect impact to the harvesting would be the delivery of material to the main portion of Big Creek. The grades of the stream at the lower end may be sufficient to settle out the larger, heavier, coarser sediment but the fines would still be transported through the water column. The cumulative impact of this action is that it adds 95 acres of harvest to an adjoining harvest by another private timber company last winter. In total there is over 130 acres harvested in the adjoining units and some drainage is to Fall Creek and all drainage eventually meets Big Creek. Fine sediment delivery is expected due to lack of buffers on first and second order streams.

Hydrology/Water Quality:

Actions on Federal Land

Road No. 29-11-15.0 (Anderson Mtn.) This road has steep sections (14-16%grade) and inadequate spacing of ditch relief culverts. The current spacing is between 400-600 feet, and should be spaced about every 200-250 feet for this road grade. In addition, several of the ditch relief culverts are rusted and water is piping through the road grade at two sites. Water is also eroding the road tread due to the steep grade and limited surface rock. This water is cutting through the shoulder in several locations. This section of road will not deliver to Fall Creek because it is separated by several hundred feet of intervening vegetation and there are no intermittent channels for ditch flow to enter.

BLM Road No. 29-11-22.0 has two locations that either the ditch enters an intermittent channel near Fall Creek or is within 50 feet of the stream and could deliver sediment from a winter haul. Best Management Practices are identified in the recommendations section herein.

Actions on Private Land

The unit is planned to be regeneration harvested. A perennial tributary to Big Creek is within the unit, but plans are to leave a 50 foot buffer along the stream. Big Creek is listed by the DEQ as water quality limited. However, this small perennial tributary stream is running north to south through the unit and will receive very little reduction in shading given the stream orientation, topographic protection and planned reserve buffer. Therefore there should be no effect on summer stream heating. There is no indication given in the application that the unit will be burned. This and the stream buffer should have a positive effect in limiting sediment delivery from the unit.

Wildlife, Including T & E and S&M Species:

No mitigation is needed or recommended beyond the design features described in the Proposed Action.

Aquatic Habitat/Fisheries /Riparian Zones Including T & E and S&M Species:

Direct and Indirect Effects (Federal Land)

The applicant is requesting to haul on BLM-controlled roads during the wet season. Hauling would occur on 1.54 miles of BLM-controlled roads 29-11-15.0 and 29-11-22.0. These roads are gravel and in some portions, are fairly steep (~14%). Currently, only half the amount of ditch relief culverts required to properly route the water effectively from the road ditches exists. Some rilling has occurred on the road surface due to the road gradient and the lack of surfacing. The majority of the culverts are rusted, plugged and/or the adjacent fill is eroding due to water passing around and under the culverts. The winter hauling would exacerbate the present poor condition of this road and increase the risk of culvert failure and fill erosion.

The uppermost (0.6 miles) portion of the haul route is over 200 feet from a Fall Creek tributary and is adequately vegetated. Therefore, this portion of the haul would not have a substantial environmental effect unless a culvert fails. The remaining 0.94 miles of haul on BLM (and gravel) contains two sites that have potential for delivery to Fall Creek. At Site #2, the road is out-sloped at a tight inside turn and the stream is approximately ten feet from the road. Silt fence installation would be required in order to prevent effects to aquatic habitat adjacent to this portion of the haul route. At Site #1, the stream is close to the road and there is a possibility of sediment reaching the stream. These are two areas which have been identified both in 'Design Features and Conservation Measures' and within the soils input that could be points of sediment delivery to stream channels during winter haul. I concur with both the soils scientist and the hydrologist; if the silt fencing (site #2) and catch basin and silt fencing (site #1) are installed as previously prescribed, sediment delivery to the stream channel can be greatly reduced or eliminated. All other stream crossings along the haul route, are within the Riparian Reserve, but are well vegetated and wide enough to filter any sediment that might be dispersed from the road. The hauling on the county paved road of 2.4 miles would have no substantial effect on the aquatics within Fall Creek. Anadromous fish distribution ends approximately half way between site #2 and site #1, or approximately 0.2 miles below site #1 (see map).

Indirect Effects from Interrelated and Interdependent Actions (Private Actions)

The applicant has proposed to haul on both Menasha ownership which borders Superior to the north and Superior Lumber ownership. This portion of the haul route is adjacent to approximately four stream headwalls. However, it is unlikely that sediment would be delivered to Fall Creek, since this will occur approximately 0.25 miles upslope from the stream.

The applicant will construct 3,000 feet of new, ridge top road on private land to access the harvest unit. The road would be constructed along and/or near a ridge top, approximately 0.2 miles from Fall Creek. This road would be constructed on a more stable soil type (see soils map) than the alternate route (see No Action).

The applicant has requested the road use permit in order to access and harvest 95 acres of timber. Harvest will occur during the winter season and would occur adjacent to a non-fish bearing tributary. The applicant has proposed to place a 50 foot buffer along this stream. Given the site conditions, a 50-foot buffer is not likely adequate to filter sediment generated from these activities to adjacent stream channels. Due to the soil type (see soils report), and stream buffer width, there is a high potential for sediment to be delivered to stream channels from the proposed actions. Additionally, future large wood recruitment would also be reduced along these streams, since harvest will occur within one site potential tree height distance from the stream channel. Although, the stream located within the harvest unit is not fish bearing, it has been documented that headwater streams contribute a high percentage of large wood to downstream fish bearing waters in coastal watersheds.

Cumulative Effects

Cumulative effects are impacts on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions (Federal or non-Federal). Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time. In general, the historic condition of aquatic habitats within the Middle Fork Coquille watershed has been documented as having abundant large wood in streams, and abundant beaver activity (Big Creek WA, 1997). The effects of human activities on aquatic and riparian habitat are primarily from timber harvest, grazing, splash dams and log drives, beaver dam removal, and the construction of extensive riparian road networks. These activities have resulted in reduced large wood and shading, reduced instream complexity, and an increase in sediment and aquatic passage barriers, as a result of culverts along roads.

Presently, the aquatic and riparian condition of the Big Creek watershed has improved (fish and riparian habitat restoration projects, culvert replacement projects, and from natural processes such as succession) since these habitat modifications have occurred. However, the aquatic and riparian condition has not been restored to historic conditions (see Big Creek WA, 1997 for a description of current conditions).

At this time, the BLM is unaware of other projects that may occur within the watershed within the foreseeable future. Federal and private routine actions are expected to occur at a similar rate as they have in the past. The portion of the proposed action that occurs on federal land, may have short term, site specific impacts, there would not be significant impacts on the aquatic and riparian habitat within watershed. However, the interrelated and interdependent portions of these actions could create larger scale impacts to the aquatic and riparian resource. These impacts are expected to occur at the sixth field scale, but not likely at the fifth field, watershed scale. Although the interrelated and interdependent portions of these actions may impact the aquatic and riparian habitat, the applicant has an alternate route to access their lands, and so the action could occur without the federal permit. If the permit were denied, the alternative would be detrimental to the fisheries and aquatic resource (see No Action). Therefore, the proposed action would have the least impact.

Endangered Species Act:

The National Marine Fisheries Service listed Oregon Coast (OC) coho salmon under the ESA as threatened on August 10, 1998 (63 FR 42587); and critical habitat for this species was designated on February 16, 2000 (65 FR 7764). OC steelhead were proposed as threatened under the ESA on August 9, 1996 (61 FR 41541), but found not warranted for listing on March 19, 1998 (63 FR 13347). OC steelhead are currently a candidate species. OC cutthroat trout are currently a candidate species (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service).

The proposed action is a *May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect* for those actions on federal land, and a *May Affect, Likely to Adversely Affect* for actions on private land (see effects above).

Essential Fish Habitat

The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) requires Federal action agencies to consult with the Secretary of Commerce regarding any action or proposed action authorized, funded, or undertaken by the agency that may adversely affect essential fish habitat (EFH) identified under the MSA. The NMFS has found that the existing National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Endangered Species Act (ESA) environmental review process, including the Interagency Streamlined Consultation Procedure for Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (July, 1999), used by the United States Forest Service (USFS) and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) for Federal Activities can be used to satisfy the EFH consultation requirements of the MSA.

As described above, the effects of the proposed action on federal land, if they occurred, would be transient, local, and of low intensity. Additionally, the conservation measures proposed as an integral part of the action would avoid, minimize, or otherwise offset potential adverse impacts to designated EFH (sediment barriers). In summary, the actions proposed on federal land would not adversely affect chinook or coho essential fish habitat.

Evaluation of Consistency with the Northwest Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines
There are no relevant Northwest Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines for Road Use Permits or interrelated/interdependent activities on private land associated with discretionary actions by federal agencies.

The proposed action is consistent with Northwest Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines for road construction within Riparian Reserves (RF-1, RF-2, RF-3, RF-4, RF-5, RF-6, RF-7).

Evaluation of Consistency with ACS Objective Components
The proposed action will not prevent attainment of ACS objectives. See Table 1.

Evaluation of Consistency with NMFS' March 18, 1997 Plan-level BO
Conservation Recommendations
A watershed analysis was completed for the Big Creek watershed, and includes an assessment of the aquatic ecosystem. This meets the LRMP BO Conservation Recommendation 3, page 47. No other Conservation Recommendations specifically apply to Right-of-Way permits.

Reasonable and Prudent Measures
An interdisciplinary approach was used to complete the preparation and review of the EA for the proposed actions. The interdisciplinary review team used applicable criteria in the Northwest Forest Plan ROD to ensure the proposed actions are consistent with applicable Standard and Guidelines.

Reasonable and Prudent Measure 1 (p.63) - During the watershed analysis and NEPA (EA) preparation and review, the Interdisciplinary (ID) review team used applicable criteria in the Northwest Forest Plan ROD to ensure the proposed actions are fully consistent with applicable standards and guidelines and ACS objectives. This is consistent with Reasonable and Prudent Measure 1.

Reasonable and Prudent Measure 2 (p. 63) - The NMFS Checklist and Matrix or Pathways and Indicators was completed and the proposed project was submitted for informal consultation and will be reviewed by the Level I Team. This is consistent with Reasonable and Prudent Measure 2.

No other Reasonable and Prudent Measures specifically apply to Road Use Permits.

Terms and Conditions
Terms and Conditions 1 (p. 66) - The proposed actions are consistent with the NFP ACS objectives. In addition, the watershed analysis and other information was used to reach the conclusion that the actions either "meet" or "do not prevent attainment" of ACS objectives.

Terms and Conditions 2 (p. 67) - The proposed project was reviewed by the Level I Team. The NMFS Checklist and Matrix of Pathways and Indicators have been completed at the 5th field watershed and site (6th field) scales. Through this process, it was determined that the proposed actions have a negligible (extremely low) probability of take of proposed/listed anadromous salmonids or destruction /adverse modification of proposed/designated critical habitat. The proposed actions will be submitted for informal consultation with the NMFS.

No other Terms and Conditions specifically apply to Road Use Permits.

Vegetation, Including T & E and S & M Species:
No affect.

Port-Orford Cedar:
There is no Port Orford Cedar along the haul route. No affect is anticipated.

Noxious Weed Species:
No mitigation is needed or recommended beyond the design features described in the Proposed Action.

Cultural Resources:
No affect anticipated

Hazardous Materials / Solid Wastes:
Provisions for Oil Spill Prevention, Control and Counter measures (SPCC) under Oregon Administrative Rule No. OAR 340-108 apply to the use of any equipment using petroleum. In addition, Oregon Forest Practices Act Section No. OAR 629-57-3600, Petroleum Product Precautions, will be in effect. An oil spill containment kit should be on site during operations, and at least one employee shall be familiar with it's use. Any reportable quantity release (see OAR 340-108) shall also be reported to the BLM representative.

Environmental Justice:
No affect.

Energy Exploration, Development, and transportation:
No affect.

Recommended Mitigation Measures:

Utilize sediment control practices and materials at two sites on Road No. 29-11-22.0 along the haul route. At Site No. 1, excavate a sediment accumulation basin in the inside ditch backed on the downstream side with hay bales so that sediments cannot enter an intermittent channel and nearby Fall Creek. At Site No. 2 install 100 feet of silt fence on the outside of the road where the road is outsloped and near Fall Creek.

IV. Persons/Agencies Consulted:

United States Fish and Wildlife Service
National Marine Fisheries Service

Preparers	Initials	Date	Speciality
Joel Robb	_______	_______	Myrtlewood Road Manager, Team Lead
Dale Stewart	_______	_______	Soil Scientist
Dan Carpenter	_______	_______	Hydrologist
Pam Olson	_______	_______	Fisheries Biologist
Jim Heaney	_______	_______	Wildlife Biologist
Nancy Brian	_______	_______	District Botanist
Bob Raper	_______	_______	District Noxious Weed Coordinator
Stephan Samuels	_______	_______	District Archaeologist, American Indian Coordinator, Environmental Justice
Tim Votaw	_______	_______	Hazardous Material Specialist
Jim Kowalick	_______	_______	Port Orford Cedar Coordinator
Tim Barnes	_______	_______	District Geologist

Date: July 10, 2002

++

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT/DECISION RECORD.

I have reviewed this environmental assessment including the explanation and resolution of any potentially significant environmental impacts. I have determined that the proposed action with the mitigation measures described in the Recommended Mitigation Measures will not have any significant impacts on the human environment and that an EIS is not required.. I have determined that the proposed project is in conformance with the approved land use plan. It is my decision to implement the project as described in the Description of the Proposed Action section with the mitigation measures listed under Recommended Mitigation Measures.

Decision recommended by: NRSA:_____ Date:_____

NRSA:_____ Date:_____

NRSA:_____ Date:_____

Decision Approved by: Myrtlewood Field Manager:_____ Date:_____